<u>REMARKS</u>

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all

of the claims of the application. Claims 1-15 are presently pending. No claims

are amended, withdrawn, cancelled, or added herein.

**Formal Request for an Interview** 

[0004] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than

allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the

Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative

for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any

outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0005] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a

telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works

great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information

may be found on the last page of this response.

Serial No.: 10/628,751

Atty Docket No.: MS1-0422USC1

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION

lee@hayes

The Business of IP™

www.leehayes.com 509.324.9256

**Substantive Matters** 

Claim Rejections under §§ 102 and/or 103

[0006] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 12, and 15 under §102.

For the reasons set forth below, the reference relied upon by the Examiner for

the §102 rejection is not a valid reference under §102.

In addition, the Examiner rejects claims 3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13, and 14 [0007]

under §103. For the reasons set forth below, the primary reference relied upon

by the Examiner for the §103 rejections is not a valid reference under §102.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 and/or [8000]

§103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references T00091

alone and/or in combination:

Mihcak: Mihcak, et al., US Patent No. 6,996,273 (filed 4/24/01;

issued 2/7/06);

Chang: Chang et al; RIME: A Replicated Image Detector for the

World-Wide Web; and

Hull: Hull, et al., US Patent No. 5,465,353.

Overview of the Application

The Application describes a technology for generating a hash value [0010]

that represents an image. Images that are visually distinct are represented by

10

Serial No.: 10/628,751

Atty Docket No.: MS1-0422USC1

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION

lee@hayes The Business of IP™

www.leehaves.com 509 324 9256

different hash values while images that are visually similar are represented by

identical hash values.

[0011] The Application was filed 7/28/07. However, the Application is a

continuation of US Patent Application No. 09/421,986, which is now issued US

Patent No. 6,671,407, which was filed 10/19/99. Accordingly, this Application

has an effective filing date of 10/19/99, which predates the filing of the Mihcak

reference. Consequently, Mihcak is not a valid reference against the Application

under §102.

**Anticipation Rejections** 

[0012] Applicant submits that the anticipation rejections are not valid

because the Application has an effective filing date prior to the filing date of the

reference on which the rejection is based.

Based upon Mihcak

[0013] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 12, and 15 under 35

U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mihcak. Applicant respectfully traverses

the rejections of these claims. Based on the reasons given above, Mihcak is not a

valid reference under §102, and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the

11

rejection of these claims.

Serial No.: 10/628,751

Atty Docket No.: MS1-0422USC1

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION

lee@h

lee&hayes The Business of IP™

**Obviousness Rejections** 

**Based upon Mihcak and Chang** 

[0014] The Examiner rejects claims 5, 7, 9, 11, and 14 under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Mihcak in view of Chang. Applicant

respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to

withdraw the rejection of these claims.

[0015] As described above, the Application has an effective filing date prior

to the filing date of Mihcak. Accordingly, Mihcak is not a valid reference under

**§103.** 

**Based upon Mihcak and Hull** 

[0016] The Examiner rejects claims 3, 6, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

being unpatentable over Mihcak in view of Hull. Applicant respectfully traverses

the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of

these claims.

[0017] As described above, the Application has an effective filing date prior

to the filing date of Mihcak. Accordingly, Mihcak is not a valid reference under

12

§103.

Serial No.: 10/628,751

Atty Docket No.: MS1-0422USC1

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION

lee hayes The Business of IP 194

## **Conclusion**

[0018] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action**. Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 9/210/07

Kayla D. Brant

Reg. No. 46576 (509) 324-9256 x242 kayla@leehayes.com www.leehayes.com

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica (509) 324-9256 x264 carly@leehayes.com

Serial No.: 10/628,751
Atty Docket No.: MS1-0422USC1
Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant
RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION

